NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are **_not_** identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: Dover Public Schools	School: Academy Street School
Chief School Administrator: Robert Becker	Address: 14 Academy Street Dover, NJ 07801
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: bbecker@dover-nj.org	Grade Levels: Pre-K -6
Title I Contact: Kevin Bullock	Principal: David Marion
Title I Contact E-mail: kbullock@dover-nj.org	Principal's E-mail: dmarion@dover-nj.org
Title I Contact Phone Number: 973-989-2000	Principal's Phone Number: 973-989-2030

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☒ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

Dave Marion	*Dave Marion*	June 30, 2015
Principal's Name	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____5_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.

- State/local funds to support the school were $ 4,085,307, which comprised 93.5% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.

- State/local funds to support the school will be $4,051,854, which will comprise 93.3% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.

- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
2 - Kindergarten Parent Meetings	#2 & #3	Y	Timesheet (PI)	$760
Summer Bridges (Parental Involvement)	#2 & #3	Y	Timesheets (PI)	$947
2 – Technology Nights K-2 – One Night 3-6 – One Night	#2 & #3	Y	Timesheets (PI)	$500
Summer Bridges Parent Materials	#2 & #3	Y	Materials (PI)	$910
Lego Story Starter Program	#2	Y	Materials	$4,156
Class Size Reduction	#1	Y	Salary	$186,285
			Benefits	$78,434
Title I Extended-day/year Programs	#2 & #3	Y	Timesheets	$24,082

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.
Add lines as necessary.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
David Marion	School Staff--Administrators	X	X	X	
Jennifer Valenti	School Staff—Classroom Teacher	X	X	X	
Monica Bialobok	School Staff – Classroom Teacher	X	X	X	
Priscilla Welbourn	School Staff – Classroom Teacher	X	X	X	
Virginia Martinez	School Staff--Support	X	X		
Maritza Gonzalez	Parent	X	X	X	
Jonathan Swack	Administration	X	X	X	
Andrew Bujno	DEAC Member / SKIP Member	x	x	x	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:
The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
September 23, 2014	Media Center	Overview of Plan w/ PAC	X			
January 13, 2015	Principal's Office	Review of Plan	X		X	
April 20, 2015	Media Center	Program Evaluation	X			
May 19, 2015	Principal's Office	Plan Development	X		X	
June 15, 2015	Media Center	Plan Development w/ PAC	X			

Add rows as necessary.

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	To build a community of parents and educators that will help students to become lifelong learners and contributors to society.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

    The process for implementing the prescribed program was broken down into a multi-step framework. The process from start to finish involved gathering data, identifying corrective actions, developing a plan, gaining the support of the learning community, and concluding with the execution of the various aspects of the plan. Academy Street School successfully implemented the majority of the prescribed plan's corrective actions.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

    As mentioned above, the implementation process involved many steps to execute. Some of the strengths identified included the collection of data to support the need for action. Another area of strength that allowed the implementation of the plan to be successful was the collective input from various members of the learning community, including but not limited to parents, students, and teachers.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

    One barrier that Academy Street School encountered was that of initial parental involvement in providing the school with constructive feedback. The low attendance was initially thought to be due to a language barrier (as over 26.9% of parents

responded that this was a barrier on the Needs Assessment Survey) and availability of parents to attend meetings (57.1% of parents identified this as a barrier). The school was able to overcome this barrier by implementing an ongoing survey program to gain parental input on a variety of topics. Surveys were distributed in both English and Spanish to ensure that all stakeholders could provide feedback. We have also experimented with staggering start times of parent meetings but haven't seen an increase from this strategy.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

    As mentioned above, one of the historical weaknesses that the school has experienced with the implementation process was gathering input from the parent population. Since implementing the ongoing survey program, this weakness has developed into a strength. Another strength of the implementation process was the teachers' willingness to participate in the many initiatives associated with the plan.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

    The teachers were the frontline stakeholders in the rolling out of many of the programs made available by the plan. The process began with the administration introducing initiatives and programs to a group of teachers. Teachers in turn reached out to the students and parents to gain their support in each new initiative. The buy-in process involved the entire learning community from top to bottom.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

   The staff's perception of the plan and its implementation was positive with 89.4% of staff members believing that student achievement can increase through effective parent involvement. IT was with this type of buy in that the teachers were able to effectively convey our expectations to the parents of the students in their classes. A Staff Needs Assessment Survey was conducted to measure the staff's perceptions.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

   Over 87% of respondents from the Parent Needs Assessment Survey felt that they were well informed and aware of the various programs made available by the school.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

   The delivery of each program associated with the plan was delivered in a two-stage approach. Teachers were introduced to the programs by the administration and in turn presented the programs to the students and their parents. This approach led to a maximum buy-in by all members of the learning community.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

   Students in need of additional educational interventions were identified in the beginning of the year based on a multiple measure matrix. Students' report card grades, standardized test scores, and teacher evaluations were used to develop a criteria for identification. Students were offered a variety of programs such as after-school tutoring classes or Summer School classes in

language arts and mathematics. The after school tutoring program was very fluid in that students were able to transition in or out of the program based on classroom performance. Two very distinct five week tutoring periods allowed for teachers to reevaluate their students to determine who would best benefit from the interventions. Additionally three Saturday Test Prep Sessions were held for a group of identified students in grade 3-6. Summer School was offered this past year to provide our younger learners (K-2) an opportunity to strengthen skills in areas identified as needing assistance.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

    The students who participated in the after-school extended day program received supplemental instruction two days a week in language arts and once a week in mathematics. Three Saturday Test Prep sessions were held for identified students in grades 3-6 for three hours a session. The Summer School program provided students with instruction in both language arts and mathematics, four days a week.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

    Academy Street School used the mylearningplan.com website to gather all data used to develop Student Growth Objectives. Pre, Mid, and End of year assessments and analyses are posted on the website. Teachers also submitted bi-weekly analyses to serve as a regular temperature-taking tool. This allowed teachers to generate class specific data to identify areas of strength and weakness as well as formulate remediation plans to address the identified weaknesses. Additional technologies used to support the program included Moby Max, RAZ Kids, Reading A-Z, and websites associated with our math and language arts text book series.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

Teachers found that the reporting and progress tracking features associated with both Moby Max and Raz-Kids were beneficial

tools. The data generated form the SGO assessments allowed teachers to identify specific areas in need of improvement.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	9		Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	While the grade 4 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 61.4% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance.
Grade 5	22		Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	While the grade 5 NJASK results outperformed the District Factor Group A average and fell just below the State average, 58.2% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance.
Grade 6	8		Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	While the grade 6 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 76% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance.

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	4	0	Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	Grade 4 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 75.7% of students

				meeting the minimum level of proficiency was below the APT standards. The increased rigor and shift in standards associated with the common core had a direct impact on student performance.
Grade 5	3	1	Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	Grade 5 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 90% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency helped the school meet the APT benchmark.
Grade 6	1	0	Title I After School Tutoring Saturday Test Prep	Grade 6 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 98.4% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency helped the school meet the APT benchmark. This score represents the highest level of proficiency in Morris County.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 1	12	N/A	The students who scored below proficiency were provided with additional language arts services through the Title I extended-day program. Students were placed in small groups and provided guided reading instruction at their appropriately identified reading level. Title I Reading Instruction was offered before school for all identified students.	Evidence that the strategies applied were effective is found in the fact that 98% of first grade students achieved their tiered objective on their Language Arts Student Growth Objective.
Grade 2	31	N/A	The students who scored below proficiency were provided with additional language arts services through the Title I extended-day program. Students were placed in small groups and provided guided reading instruction at their appropriately identified reading level. Title I Reading Instruction was offered before school	Evidence that the strategies applied were effective is found in the fact that 93% of second grade students achieved their tiered objective on their Language Arts Student Growth Objective.

			for all identified students.	

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 1	4	N/A	Students were provided with additional in-class support in the identified areas of weakness. The teacher individualized instruction to solidify the foundational skills identified as weak.	Evidence that the strategies applied were effective is found in the fact that 98% of first grade students achieved their tiered objective on their Mathematics Student Growth Objective.
Grade 2	2	N/A	Students were provided with additional in-class support in the identified areas of weakness. The teacher individualized instruction to solidify the foundational skills identified as weak.	Evidence that the strategies applied were effective is found in the fact that 93% of second grade students achieved their tiered objective on their Mathematics Student Growth Objective.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	K-6	Drop Everything And Read	Administrators' review and approval of classroom schedules. Schedules reflected a daily reading block that was reserved for pleasurable reading.	The daily DEAR period provided students with the ability to read a book of their choice. This daily reading period ensured that students were independently reading each day of the school year. Evidence of the implementation of these strategies could be found in their inclusion in teacher's weekly lesson plans. Student Growth Objective results in the area of language arts showed that 100% of results were either effective or highly effective meaning that a minimum of 80% of students met their tiered language arts objective.
ELA & Mathematics	K-6	Data Analysis	Administrative review, approval of weekly lesson plans, bi-weekly assessment analysis, SGO benchmark assessments.	An initiative at Academy Street School this past year was to utilize data gathered from a variety of sources to drive classroom instruction. Each analysis required teachers to perform an item analysis to identify areas of strength and weakness, as well as formulate a plan to remediate the identified areas of weakness. The data generated from these reports provided teachers with a drilled down set of data for their specific class. Teachers were able to identify the individualized needs of their students and tailor their instruction to meet these needs.
ELA & Mathematics	K-6	Benchmark Testing	Achievement of Student Growth Objectives	In accordance with the newly adopted Stronge Evaluation Model, teachers were required to establish Student Growth Objectives. Objectives that were implemented were formulated keeping a minimum proficiency level in mind. 26/26 classrooms that teach language arts had a minimum of 80% of their students achieve their tiered objective for this subject. 27/27 in Mathematics.
ELA & Mathematics	K-6	Model Curriculum	Administrative review, approval of weekly lesson plans, bi-weekly assessment	Teachers were introduced to the State Department of Education's Model Curriculum Website. The administration would make comments based on the inclusion or lack there of in weekly lesson plans. 26/26 classrooms that teach

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
			assessments.		language arts had a minimum of 80% of their students achieve their tiered objective for this subject. 27/27 in Mathematics.
ELA & Mathematics	K-6	Technology Program Implentation	Administrative review, approval of weekly lesson plans, bi-weekly assessment analysis, SGO benchmark assessments.		Teachers infused a variety of technological programs into the curriculum. Programs include RAZ-Kids, Moby Max, and schoolworksite. These programs are designed to address students learning needs on their instructional level and thus ensure differentiation exists. Also students participated in a Keyboarding and PARCC readiness program. The focus of this program was to improve students abilities using technology in preparation for the upcoming computerized assessment. Results from the recently administered PARCC will determine the effectiveness of the technology implementation.

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Grades 3-6	Title I Extended Day LA		Class Lists, PARCC Results	As a result of the school's Title One Extended Day Program during the 2013-2014 school year, 45% of participants scored proficient or advanced on the Language Arts section of the NJASK. 2013-2014 Attendance Rates: On average students who participated in the Title One After School Program attended classes 84% of the time. 51 students attended

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					100% of sessions that were offered.
Math	Grades 3-6	Title I Extended Day Math		Class Lists, PARCC Results	As a result of the school's Title I Extended Day Program during the 2013-2014 school year, 52% of participants scored proficient or advanced on the Language Arts section of the NJASK. 2013-2014 Attendance Rates: On average students who participated in the Title One After School Program attended classes 88% of the time. 42 students attended 100% of sessions that were offered.
ELA/Math	Grades 3-6	Saturday Test Prep ELA & Mathematics		Class Lists, PARCC Results	2013-2014 Attendance Rates: On average students who participated in the Title One After School Program attended classes 64.5% of the time.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA/Math	Kindergarten	District Wide PLC	YES	Attendance Sheets and Lesson Plans	Kindergarten Teachers from across the district met on a monthly basis to share ideas and prepare differentiated lessons to be implemented in the classroom.
Math/ELA	K-6	Vertical Articulation PLC	YES	Attendance and Lesson Plans	Teachers from one grade level above or below met on an ongoing basis to identify concepts that had shifted with the implementation of the Common Core Standards.
All Areas	K-6	Engagement Strategies	YES	Lesson Plans	Teachers were provided with PD in the area of student engagement. Lessons learned

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					from the best selling book "Teach Like A Pirate" were explored and implemented in lesson plans across the curriculum.
Math/ELA	All	PARCC Training	Yes	PARCC Administration	Teachers were trained to administer the PARCC Assessments both EOY and PBA as well as the Infrastructure Trial.
All Areas	K-6	Mandated Trainings	Yes	Attendance Sheets	In accordance with mandates the teachers received training in topics such as Suicide Prevention, HIB, Asthma, BBP, and other subjects.

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA/Math	Kindergarten	Kindergarten Orientation	Yes	Survey Results	The program provided incoming kindergarten parents and students with an overview of the school policies, programs, schedule and expectations. 100% of parents surveyed found this program to be helpful.
Math/ELA	First Grade	Preparing My Child For First Grade	Yes	Survey Results and Sign In Sheets	This program invited parents with an overview of the first grade curriculum and expectations. Parents were provided strategies to prepare their children for the next year. This event was well attended with 33 parents in attendance.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA/Math	K-6	Back To School Night	Yes	Sign In Sheets	This evening event affords the parents the opportunity to visit the school, learn about the initiatives are for the school year, and meet their child's classroom teacher. 88.4% of Academy Street School's parents attended this event.
Math	K-6	Parent Advisory Council Meetings	Yes	Survey Results	Parents in attendance were provided with an overview of the school's Title One programs, aided in the development of the School – Parent Compact, and the opportunity to have their voice heard on topics pertaining to the school and the programming that is being provided. Some findings from the meetings included: • Survey results showed that 92.7% of our parents read the weekly menugram on a regular basis. • Survey results revealed that only 36.6% of parents visit the teacher web pages to verify their child's assigned homework. Increase of over 10% • Survey results showed that the majority of parents (89.8%) would prefer to be kept informed of school events via email (40.3%) or text (49.5%). • 59.7% of parents claimed that language is not a barrier for communication.
All Areas	K-6	Family Fun Nights	Yes	Attendance	In conjunction with PTA, the school hosted a variety of Family Fun Night events. Events included a Fall Festival, a Holiday Shop, An Ice Cream Social, a Dance Night, and a Bingo Night. The attendance at these events was very positive

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					with an approximate average of 75-100 families represented at each event.
Math/ Science	K-6	Bayer Science Night	Yes	Attendance and Survey Results	Academy Street School teamed up with Bayer Pharmaceuticals to present a family event that involved parents working with their children to conduct four science experiments. Parents feed back was very positive from this event with 84.9% of parents claiming that they would use the information from the event and apply it at home with their children.
ELA/Math	K, 1, & 5	Summer Bridges		SGO and PARCC Results	Measurable outcomes can not be determined at the time of the submission of this document. This section will be updated with data generated from the 2015-2016 administration of the PARCC and the Student Growth Objective data generated when the final benchmark assessments are administered.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☒ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

Dave Marion   *Dave Marion*   June 30, 2015
Principal's Name   **Principal's Signature**   **Date**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2014-2015

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – ELA	NJASK 3/4/5/6	**Grade 3** - While the grade 3 NJASK results outperformed the District Factor Group A and fell just below State averages, 62.3% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance. **Grade 4** - While the grade 4 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 61.4% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance. **Grade 5** - While the grade 5 NJASK results outperformed the District Factor Group A average and fell just below the State average, 58.2% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards. The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance **Grade 6** - While the grade 6 NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 76% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency resulted in the school not meeting the APT standards.

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		The increased rigor and lexile reading levels associated with the common core standards had a direct impact on student performance.
Academic Achievement - Writing	Writing Student Growth Objectives	100% of teachers have achieved their writing SGO at a minimum performance level of effective.
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	NJASK 3/4/5/6	**Grade 3** NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 79.2% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency was below the APT standards. The increased rigor and shift in standards associated with the Common Core had a direct impact on student performance. **Grade 4** NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 75.7% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency was below the APT standards. The increased rigor and shift in standards associated with the common core had a direct impact on student performance. **Grade 5** NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 90% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency helped the school meet the APT benchmark. **Grade 6** NJASK results outperformed both the District Factor Group A and State averages, 98.4% of students meeting the minimum level of proficiency helped the school meet the APT benchmark. This score represents the highest level of proficiency in Morris County.
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Surveys conducted at various parent involvement activities	
Professional Development	LPDC	The Academy Street School staff feels that meaningful professional development has a direct influence on the learning taking place in the classroom. Results from the staff

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		needs assessment survey conveyed the following: 94.6% of staff members believe that effective parental involvement can result in increased student achievement. 81.2% of the staff showed an interest in professional development opportunities focused on the PARCC assessment. 79.5% of staff showed an interest in professional development opportunities focused on assessment strategies 82.7% of staff members showed in interest in professional development opportunities focused on the common core standards. Staff members are more than willing to participate in opportunities that are made available to them by the district and or the school. A real push will be made in the direction of promoting self-directed learning through the use of Professional Learning Communities. Teachers participated in grade level, vertical articulation and district wide PLC's during the current school year. Topics included: Comprehension Strategies, Expository and Opinion Writing, Differentiation, Phonics, Fluency, Assessment Strategies, Leveled Learning Centers, Shifts in Common Core, and Technology in the Classroom.
Leadership	Needs Assessment For Staff	Findings from School Climate Survey of Staff Members Revealed: • 93.4% of parents feel comfortable speaking to the school's administration, while 6.5% were neutral on the subject. • 97.1% of staff members surveyed felt that the school's administration treated others with respect. • 88.6% of staff members surveyed felt like the school's administrators back them up when they need it, with 11.4% remaining neutral on the topic. • 97.1% of the teaching staff feel that the school administrators promote the success of all students, with one respondent remaining neutral on the topic.
School Climate and Culture	Needs Assessment For Parents	Findings from the Needs Assessment Survey For Parents and School Climate Survey of Staff Members Revealed: • 91.8% of parents feel comfortable speaking to the school's administration, while

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		6.5% were neutral on the subject. • 94.5% of parents feel comfortable talking with their child's teacher • 92% of parents feel welcome and appreciated when coming to school with 7% reporting Neutral

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

1. **What process did the school use to conduct its needs assessment?**

   The needs assessment was conducted using a multi-tiered approach. A comprehensive needs assessment was conducted over a several month period. The school wide planning committee created a school profile by assessing the current status of the school with respect to student needs, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization.

2. **What process did the school used to collect and compile data for student subgroups?**

   Data released by the NJDOE pertaining to the NJASK results for all student subgroups is a primary source of data that is collected by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools and compiled in a district database. The scores of students in the district less than one year are removed and the subgroup scores are analyzed. Scores are compared with AYP and Safe Harbor scores for the school. School report card data is also analyzed, and the results are compared to county and state averages.

3. **How does the school ensure that the data used in the needs assessment is valid and reliable?**

   The State of New Jersey ensures NJASK scores are statistically reliable by employing a 95% confidence interval around AYP and a 75% confidence interval around Safe Harbor. Academy Street School also had over 95% of each subgroup assessed adding to the validity of the data.

   Several measures were taken to preserve the integrity of the needs assessment survey. The school wide planning team used a comprehensive needs assessment survey. Since the majority of families are native Spanish speakers, the parent survey was distributed in English and Spanish. The school wide planning team added to the validity and reliability of the needs assessment survey by allotting ample time for stakeholders to complete the survey and included multiple stakeholder groups in the needs assessment process.

4. **What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?**

   The most readily available testing data revealed that Academy Street School was not able to meet the progress targets in all areas. The school scored in the 94th percentile in academic achievement when compared to peer schools and in the 52nd percentile statewide with 50% of targets met. The school scored in the 94th percentile in the area of college and career readiness when compared to peer schools and in the 71st percentile statewide meeting 100% of targets. While the school did meet it's progress targets, there were some areas of concern. Student growth showed that the school performed in the 68th percentile when compared to peer schools and 55th percentile when compared statewide.

5. **What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?**

   Results from the analysis of standardized testing data revealed that the teaching staff needed additional professional development in the area of language arts and the common core standards. In addition to mandated trainings, the staff was encouraged to take a more self-directed learning approach. Teachers took advantage of webinars on a variety of topics and feel that they would like to explore professional development opportunities on PARCC, assessment strategies, and the common core standards. Professional development in these areas will support the district vision of using data to drive instruction in this educational landscape of increased rigors and expectations. Teachers all participated in PLCs to support their growth as educators in the classroom.

6. How does the school identify its educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

In addition to using a district database to track students' achievement on state assessments, pre-and post-assessments along with student grades and teacher recommendation are used to identify at-risk students in a timely manner. Teachers use benchmark assessments and report cards to identify students who they feel would benefit from the Intervention and Referral Service.

7. How does the school provide effective assistance to its educationally at-risk students?

Educationally at-risk students are afforded opportunities to attend afternoon extended-day tutoring sessions in the area language arts and mathematics. Title I teachers create fluid groups of students to ensure that individualized needs are being met for any and all at-risk students. The focus of these groups is to solidify foundational skills. In addition to these options, students in grades three through six are offered to attend a Saturday test Prep program that provided the students with additional assistance in the areas of language arts and mathematics. Also, identified students in grade four through six were provided with additional math assistance once a week by the school's sixth grade mathematics teacher.

8. How does the school address the needs of its migrant students? N/A

9. How does the school address the needs of its homeless students? N/A

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Teachers were engaged in decisions regarding the appropriate use of assessments through the use of grade level meetings. During these monthly meetings, teachers review NJASK assessment data, discuss effective instructional strategies, and develop appropriate assessments.   A benchmarking testing plan was implemented to monitor teacher's Student Growth Objective at three distinct times of the school year.

11. How does the school help its students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school and/or middle to high school?

Students attending the school as kindergarten students are invited along, with their parents, to participate in an orientation session in the month of August. This orientation provides parents with a variety of information about the school and the kindergarten program, while the future kindergarten students participate in classroom activities with the current kindergarten classes. Sixth Grade parents are invited to attend an orientation meeting with their child to familiarize themselves with the landscape and expectations of Dover Middle School. The students participate in an orientation of the building and an overview of the programing available to them during the month of June.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

The district and the school use multiple measures to identify areas in need of improvement. Both the administration and the teaching staff conduct a thorough analysis of the NJASK. Surveys are distributed to the staff and the parent population to gather information to make informed decisions about instructional programming.

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process

Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Teachers to Reduce Class Size	Improving Language Arts Literacy and Reading Instruction- Grades 1-6 (CCSS)
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Attainment of the Annual Performance Targets	Close the achievement gap and increase the level of language arts and reading achievement for all students on the NJASK. The school did not meet all of the Annual Performance Targets in 2013 - 2014.
Describe the root causes of the problem	In order to make the necessary academic gains, many students need a high level of individualized instruction, which smaller class sizes will foster.	Over 70% of our student population reside in households in which English is not the primary language spoken.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All students	All students
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Schoolwide (LAL) Schoolwide (Math) Hispanic (LAL) Hispanic (Math) Economically Disadvantaged (LAL) Economically Disadvantaged (Math)	Schoolwide (LAL) Hispanic (LAL) Economically Disadvantaged (LAL)
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	The Principles of Educational Reform: *Guidance for Class-Size Reduction Program* (April 2000) *The Schooling Practices That Matter Most* (2000) by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory	*Research-Based Content Area Reading Instruction (2002)* by Texas Reading Initiative I*mproving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices* (August 2008) from The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance *Effective Practices for Developing Reading Comprehension (2002)* by What Research Has to Say About Reading, Third Edition
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State	Teachers develop lessons that are aligned with the district's curriculum guides. Lessons also support the attainment of the	Teachers develop lesson that are aligned with the district's curriculum guides. Lessons also support the attainment of the district's student

Standards?	district's student learning goals, which are predicated around the Common Core Standards.	learning goals, which are predicated around the Common Core Standards.

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3
Name of priority problem	Improving Mathematics Instruction-Grades 1-6 (CCSS)
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Close the achievement gap and increase the level of math achievement for all students on the PARCC.
Describe the root causes of the problem	The total proficiency percentages for all subgroups decreased when compared to the previous year. As a result, the school was required to apply the confidence interval in order to achieve its Annual Performance Targets (2012 – 2013).
Subgroups or populations addressed	All students
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Schoolwide (Math) Hispanic (Math) Economically Disadvantaged (Math)
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	*Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools* (May 2008) from The Institute of Education Sciences *Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (2009)* from The Institute of Education Sciences
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Teachers develop lesson that are aligned with the district's curriculum guides. Lessons also support the attainment of the district's student learning goals, which are predicated around the Common Core Standards.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . "

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
EAL & Mathematics	Grades 1-6	Class Size Reduction	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	The Principles of Educational Reform: *Guidance for Class-Size Reduction Program* (April 2000) *The Schooling Practices That Matter Most* (2000) by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
ELA	Grades 1-5	*RAZ KIDS	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*What Works Clearinhouse* *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*
ELA	K-6	Data Driven Instruction	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of PARCC benchmarks and Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*What Works Clearinhouse* *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*
ELAL/Math	K-6	*Moby Max	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets and student portfolio analysis Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*What Works Clearinhouse* *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*
ELAL/Math	K-6	*Engagement Strategies	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets	*The Schooling Practices That Matter Most* (2000) by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
ELAL/Math	K-6	Teacher Created Company Summer School Program "Intervention Reading and Mathematics"	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA/Math	K-6	*SAMR – Technology Integration to promote higher level thinking skills	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance
ELA	Grade 4	*Lego Story Starter	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

***Use an asterisk to denote new programs**.

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
LAL & Mathematics	Grades 1-6	Extended Day Tutoring	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance
LAL & Mathematics	Grades 3-6	Saturday Test Prep	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Attainment of Student Growth Objectives	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance
LAL & Mathematics	K-5	Extended School Year	Mr. David Marion Principal	Attainment of the Annual Performance Targets Weekly Assessment of basic foundational grade level skills.	*Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement* (July 2009) by The Institute of Education Services (IES) National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					

*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.					
LAL	K-6	Professional Learning Communities	Principal Vice Principal	Schedule of PLC time, meeting agendas, meeting notes, and meeting report forms Participants may be requested to turn-key findings at a bi-weekly faculty meeting.	*Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making.* (September 2009) by What Works Clearinghouse
Mathematics	K-6	Professional Learning Communities	Principal Vice Principal	Schedule of PLC time, meeting agendas, meeting notes, and meeting report forms Participants may be requested to turn-key findings at a bi-weekly faculty meeting.	*Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making.* (September 2009) by What Works Clearinghouse
Assessment	K-6	Professional Learning	Principal	Schedule of PLC time, meeting agendas, meeting notes, and	*Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Community		meeting report forms Participants may be requested to turn-key findings at a bi-weekly faculty meeting.	*Making.* (September 2009) by What Works Clearinghouse
All	K-6	*SAMR Training	Principal	The inclusion of student centered technology to address higher order thinking skills in teacher lesson plans	*The Leadership of the Improvement of Teaching and Learning: Lessons From Initiatives with Positive Outcomes for Students. The Free Library (November 1, 2007)*
All	K-6	*Apple Cohort Training	Principal	The inclusion of student centered technology to address higher order thinking skills in teacher lesson plans	*The Leadership of the Improvement of Teaching and Learning: Lessons From Initiatives with Positive Outcomes for Students. The Free Library (November 1, 2007)*

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the school wide program for 2014-2015? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally?

    School and district staff will review Academy Street School's Title I Schoolwide Program.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

    One of the ongoing challenges that Academy Street School faces and anticipates encountering during the implementation process of this plan is the parental commitment to the programs made available to them.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

    The teachers are the frontline stakeholders in the rolling out of many of the programs made available by the plan. The process will begin with the administration introducing initiatives and programs to a group of teachers. Teachers in turn will reach out to the students and parents to gain their support in each new initiative. The buy-in process involved the entire learning community from top to bottom.

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

    Staff surveys will be administered to measure the perceptions of the staff on a variety of topics as they relate to the Title I programing.

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

    Parent surveys will be administered to measure the perceptions of the staff on a variety of topics as they relate to the Title I programming.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

Academy Street School will have a number of supports in place to structure student interventions. A Title I Extended-Year Summer Program will be offered to students in Kindergarten – Grade 5. The focus of the program will be to bridge the achievement gap in both mathematics and language arts. A Title I Extended Day Program may be made available for students in grade 1 – 6. This program's focus will be to provide academic supports in identified areas of weakness as identified from both   standardized testing and benchmark testing results. Additionally a Saturday Test Prep Program may be made available for students in grade 3-6.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Students attending the Extended-Year Summer Program will receive services four days a week during the month of July for a total of 16 sessions. Extended-Day students will participate in four/five week cycles three days a week.   Saturday Test Prep attendees will receive services on four Saturday mornings leading up to testing.

8. What resources/ technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

The school will use numerous technological resources to support the program. A multitude of websites such as RAZ Kids, Reading A-Z, Schoolworksite, MobyMax, thinkcentral, and Go Math will be used to support the Schoolwide Program. Additionally an online assessment vehicle that is concomitant to the PARCC and its' associated required skills.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

The school will use a variety of quantitative sources such as standardized testing results and benchmark results to measure the effectiveness of the interventions put in place. The fluid nature of the programs design allows for students to cycle through the program based on current academic performance.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the school wide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

Parents are informed on the effectiveness of programs through a variety of information dissemination techniques. Results of the program are presented and discussed at all Parent Advisory Counsel Meetings and Parent Teacher Association Meetings. Additionally similar results are shared at a Board of Education meeting along with standardized testing results.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	K-6	Literacy Nights	Mr. David Marion Principal	In addition to evaluating the number of parents in attendance, feedback from participants will be documented, and students' PARCC scores will be analyzed.	Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review Building Collaboration Between Schools and Parents of English Language Learners: Transcending Barriers, Creating Opportunities (2008) by National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems
Math/ELA	K-6	Parent Information Nights	Mr. David Marion Principal	In addition to evaluating the number of parents in attendance, feedback from participants will be documented, and students' PARCC scores will be analyzed.	Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review
ELA/Math	K	Kindergarten Parent Meetings	Mr. David Marion Principal	In addition to evaluating the number of parents in attendance, feedback from participants will be documented, and students' classroom performance will be analyzed.	Shannahan, T., Et a (2010) Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3RD Grade
All Areas	K-6	Frequent and Ongoing Surveys For Parents	Mr. David Marion Principal	Positive feedback from surveys measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of our parent programming and school related events and practices.	Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review Building Collaboration Between Schools and Parents of English Language Learners: Transcending Barriers, Creating

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					Opportunities (2008) by National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems
LAL	K-6	Summer Bridges Workshops and Materials	Mr. David Marion Principal	In addition to evaluating the number of parents in attendance, feedback from participants will be documented, and students' PARCC scores will be analyzed.	Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review

Building Collaboration Between Schools and Parents of English Language Learners: Transcending Barriers, Creating Opportunities (2008) by National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems |
| All Areas | K-6 Parents | Parent Advisory Council | Mr. David Marion Principal | Participant feedback
Number of participants | Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review |
| ELA | ELL | *ELL Classes | Mr. David Marion Principal | Participant feedback
Number of participants
Pre/Post Tests | Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review

Building Collaboration Between Schools and Parents of English Language Learners: Transcending Barriers, Creating Opportunities (2008) by National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems |
| All Areas | K-6 | *Parent Technology Nights | Mr. David Marion Principal | In addition to evaluating the number of parents in attendance, feedback from participants will be documented, and students' PARCC scores will be analyzed. Also many of the programs produce usage reports that will be analyzed to determine if parents are | Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests (2003) by Urban Review

Building Collaboration Between Schools and Parents of English Language Learners: |

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				having their students access purchased websites outside of school.	Transcending Barriers, Creating Opportunities (2008) by National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?
An emphasis will be placed on conducting PI activities that will enhance parents' English Language acquisition, so they develop the skills needed to support and hone their child's reading and writing ability at home. Additionally PI programs will focus on uses of computer-based programs that can be used in the home to reinforce learned concepts.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

   Parents are invited to attend and actively participate in two (2) Title I Parental Involvement meetings, which are held in September and June.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

   The Parental Involvement Policy is mailed home and available on the school website.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

   The School-Parent Compact is reviewed and revised, as necessary, during the two (2) annual Title I Parental Involvement meetings.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

   The School-Parent Compact is mailed home and available on the school website.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

   Student achievement is reported at Board of Education meetings, in which the principal presents the school's NJASK/PARCC results and reviews school report card data. In addition, student achievement is published in the district newsletter and available on the district website.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?
The district has met its annual measurable objectives for Title III.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

   Disaggregated assessment results are reported at Board of Education meetings, in which the principal presents the school's assessment results and reviews the school's NJDOE School Performance Report.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

   The school involves families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan by conducting collaborative Parent Advisory Council and Title I Parental Involvement meetings. Additionally, family and community input is garnered from feedback forms that are collected following school events, a parent survey that is distributed during the year, and countless conversations that are held between building administrators and family/community members.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

    In order to inform parents about their child's assessment results, the school mails each student's individual score report.

    In addition, parents are provided with quarterly marking period grades and weekly/bi-weekly progress reports, as necessary. Furthermore, parent-teacher conferences are held at least once a year; however, they are also scheduled throughout the course of the year at the request of teachers and/or parents.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

    Funds will be used to pay facilitators to conduct numerous parent programs in the areas of ELA, mathematics, and technology. Furthermore, materials will be purchased for the Summer Bridges Program, which has been an effective strategy the past two years.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	38	Teachers are offered opportunities to grow professionally through engagement in sustained, job-embedded activities outlined in the SPDC / LPDC and all components of the Mentoring Plan are implemented as well. Opportunities to increase content knowledge are provided and supported by the district, including graduate coursework specific to the teachers' teaching assignment.
	100%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0	
	0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	14	Paraprofessionals are offered opportunities to grow professionally through engagement in district and school-level professional development activities. This support will enable the school to attract and retain highly qualified paraprofessionals.
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	
	0	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
Academy Street Elementary School will use professional development and novice teacher mentor training to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers. An overview of the school and district's professional support systems will be highlighted during the interview process and carefully planned and implemented during the year.	Principal and ScIP members